

thousand pounds to over 7 million pounds in 2000. According to this year's recorded import numbers, imports are reaching levels of 2 million pounds per month and on target to reach over 20 million pounds in this year alone. As of May this year, Vietnamese imports of frozen fish fillets were equivalent to 20 percent of the sales of the United States farm-raised frozen fillets.

There are over 189,000 acres of land in catfish production, of which 110,000 are in my home state of Mississippi. U.S. catfish farmers produce 600 million pounds of farm-raised catfish annually and require 1.8 billion pounds of feed. This supports over 90,000 acres of corn, 500,000 acres of soybeans, and cotton seed from over 230,000 acres of cotton.

This very young industry has created a catfish market where none had previously existed. They have done this by investing substantial capital to producing a quality product which the consumer considers to be reliable, safe, and healthy. We can not allow unfair competition to destroy the livelihood of farmers, processors, employees, and communities which depend on the American catfish industry.

Before we expand trade relations with Vietnam, our two governments must resolve this issue in a way that ensures the quality and safety of Vietnamese imported fish products. The Administration must also enforce current law so that our American catfish producers are not unfairly put out of business. I am hopeful this issue can be resolved so that all Americans can enjoy the benefits of free and fair trade with Vietnam.

#### PROGRESS ON CURING PARKINSON'S DISEASE

SPEECH OF

**HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 6, 2001*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to come to the floor this evening to mark the fourth anniversary of the passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act, an anniversary that occurred this week.

In 1999, along with my friends and colleagues, FRED UPTON, LANE EVANS, JOE SKEEN, MARK UDALL, TOM UDALL, and HENRY WAXMAN, I formed the Congressional Working Group on Parkinson's Disease. The Working Group strives to ensure that the nation's decision makers remain ever aware of the needs of the more than one million Americans struggling with the devastating disease of Parkinson's.

Four years ago this past Monday, Senator WELLSTONE was successful in adding the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act as an amendment to the Senate FY98 Labor-HHS Appropriations bill. Not surprisingly, the amendment was approved by a vote of 95-3.

Named for Arizona Representative Mo Udall to honor his legacy, the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act was originally introduced on April 9, 1997 in the House of Representatives. Mr. UPTON and Mr. WAXMAN were the bill's lead sponsors in the House,

with Senators MCCAIN and WELLSTONE sponsoring it in the Senate. In the 105th Congress, this bill, H.R. 1260, had 255 cosponsors in the House; I was a proud original cosponsor, too.

The Udall Act expanded basic and clinical research in Parkinson's Disease. It established Udall Centers of Excellence around the country and set up the Morris K. Udall Awards in Parkinson's Research to provide grants to scientists who are working to cure Parkinson's.

One of the eleven Udall Centers is located in the great city of New York. The Morris Udall Center for Parkinson Disease Research at Columbia University is doing innovative research, including identifying new genes that, when either expressed or suppressed, contribute to the degeneration of key nerve cells. The New York group is also investigating gender and ethnic differences in people with Parkinson's Disease. Notably, too, Columbia University's Dean of Medicine is the former Director of NIH's National Institutes of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Dr. Gerald Fischbach. The work at this Udall Center, as well as Centers across the country, is leading to a better understanding of the brain and how this disease affects it. The groundbreaking research at the Udall Centers, as well as our nation's public and private sector research effort, will lead to better treatment and a cure for Parkinson's.

In this Congress, I will proudly join Congressman MARK and TOM UDALL and members of the Congressional Working Group to introduce a reauthorization of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act. I urge all of my colleagues to join us in reauthorizing this important legislation.

In the spirit of Mo Udall's tenacity and strength of purpose, we cannot stop now. We must wholeheartedly support Parkinson's research until we find a cure!

As the President has said, we must continue on path to doubling the NIH budget by 2003.

In last year's appropriations, \$71.4 million of the NIH budget was designated for Parkinson's Disease research. But this is only year-one funding of the NIH's Five Year Plan for Parkinson's Disease Research. We have to remain vigilant and keep the pressure on.

Leading scientists describe Parkinson's as the most curable neurological disorder! That is why I urge my colleagues to support the second-year funding of the Five Year NIH Plan. Recent advances in Parkinson's Disease research have given us great hope that a cure is imminent. The science regarding Parkinson's has advanced to a stage where greater management and coordination of the federally-funded research effort will accelerate the pace of scientific progress dramatically. I ask all my colleagues to support NIH's research agenda by fully funding the \$143.5 million increase for FY02 in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Secondly, we must continue to fund the U.S. Army's Neurotoxin Exposure Treatment Research Program. The research not only strives to improve the treatment of neurological diseases, but also aims to identify the causes of disease and prevent them.

I am heartened by the scientific progress being made. We are so close to a cure of this disease.

As you may know, this is a personal issue for many of us. Some of our colleagues are

struggling with Parkinson's or have family members who are living with this illness. My own father has been afflicted by Parkinson's. I have seen the impact of this disease first hand and have spoken to the experts. Professionals at NIH have said that this disease is curable within as little as 5 years. My government should be a part of that research.

Better treatment and a cure for Parkinson's Disease also depends on stem cell research. With further research into embryonic stem cells, scientists should be able to reprogram the stem cells into the dopamine-producing cells which are currently lost in Parkinson's Disease. President Bush's August decision to fund limited types of stem cell research is a small step forward for this life saving medical research, though a limited one indeed. The President's decision to permit research on existing cell lines, without allowing for the derivation of new cell lines, falls short in the eyes of many top medical researchers. Experts tell us that different cell lines hold disparate research and therapeutic potential, and elimination of federal funding for certain lines will hold major consequences. I am quite troubled by what Secretary Tommy Thompson said yesterday. He noted that less than one-third of the embryonic stem cells lines that President Bush and said were available for federally-funded research are fully developed and currently adequate for research. This is unacceptable. We must not tie the hands of the scientists.

So again, I urge my colleagues to support the scientists and the researchers who are battling this disease by providing the funding levels needed to cure Parkinson's. In addition, we must keep the pressure on the NIH to stay true to their Five Year Plan for Parkinson's Disease Research. Let this be the Congress that history points to that fulfilled the promise of the Udall Act and provided the unwavering support that led to an end to Parkinson's Disease.

#### HONORING IDA WELLS ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, September 10, 2001*

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join the many family, friends, and colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding member of the New Haven, CT, community—Ida Wells. Ida is a tremendous individual who has shown an unparalleled dedication and commitment to our community and it is my privilege to honor her today as she celebrates her retirement from the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority of the city of New Haven.

Originally from Newark, NJ, Ida first came to New Haven from New York City only 16 years ago. In that time, she has developed a reputation as one of the leading advocates for public housing residents. Ida, a public housing resident herself, became active in her building as a way to fill her time. Prior to her appointment to the Housing Board of Commissioners, Ida served as Crawford Manor's tenant council president for 8 years. Even then, Ida was one

of the first people her neighbors turned to when they needed a strong voice on their behalf.

As a Commissioner, Ida's job has not always been easy. With tedious budget reviews and resolutions to consider, she has often said that at first she felt like she was in the middle of a three ring circus. Her fellow commissioners have described Ida as a calming force during tense meetings—always asking the sensible question, what will this do for the residents? While she may have looked like the mild-mannered patron of the board, Ida has been one of the most outspoken members when addressing the treatment of public housing residents, especially her beloved seniors. She has shown a remarkable dedication to her job and has done much to enrich the lives of many families and seniors. Most recently, Ida started a partnership with Yale University with the hope that the program will connect Crawford Manor residents with the rest of their community through neighborhood events and trips to the theater. Ida brought a wealth of knowledge to the board from her years of experience as a tenant—demonstrating a unique commitment to ensuring real change for her neighbors and fellow public housing residents.

After nearly two decades of service as a resident representative, you can be sure that Ida's retirement from the Board of Commissioners will not impede her from continuing to advocate for public housing residents. Though she will certainly be missed in her official capacity, I am sure her strong voice will continue to be heard. It is with the greatest thanks and appreciation for her outstanding service to our community that I stand today to honor Ida Wells on this very special occasion and extend my very best wishes to her for many more years of health and happiness.

VERMONT HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT  
CONGRESSIONAL TOWN MEETING

**HON. BERNARD SANDERS**

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, September 10, 2001*

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the outstanding work done by participants in my Student Congressional Town Meeting held this summer. These participants were part of a group of high school students from around Vermont who testified about the concerns they have as teenagers, and about what they would like to see government do regarding these concerns.

I submit these statements to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe that the views of these young persons will benefit my colleagues.

ON BEHALF OF WILL BABCOCK—REGARDING  
TRADE SKILLS FOR YOUNG VERMONTERS,  
MAY 7, 2001

Will Babcock. Like I said, I'm Will Babcock, here representing Youth Build. Skateland, from Williston, got closed down recently. I'm trying to reopen it. I have plans to talk to J.D. Real Estate to see how much the lease per year is, and if I can get it cheaper for a youth organization. Because, let's face it: In Burlington, there is really nothing to do but play basketball, hang out

at the mall or hang out on the streets. So I think skating is a fun, healthy activity. It is a good thing to do. I'm in love with it, you know. Let's see. I have talked to everyone I can about it. That is why I'm here today, to see if I can get any help from Bernie or anybody with political power to get the ball rolling, get it open again. I've organized a skate club at school. I have got people at school doing it. All my teachers are interested in it. And, recently, to go roller skating, I've had to go to Latham, New York, three hours away. It is three hours away, four hours of roller skating, three hours back. Because, you know, I can't really afford a hotel room, so I have to come back the same night. I have talked to Pat McGirk, the guy that got the skate park down here by the waterfront started. I have been talking to him to see if I can get something going there. I would like to try and find some backers who think this is a good idea and want to help me get it going. I have gone to a couple of other meetings besides these, with churches and town halls and stuff. So it is getting around. People are starting to hear about it again. I'm hoping that it is more than just "hear," that people will start saying: "Yes, I'm going to help this kid do it. It is a good thing to do." Like I said, I have support from Youth Build, Middle Friend and Family, and everyone that roller skates, probably about a good 20, 25 of us. I need help in any way possible, so if you guys know somebody that can get into an idea like that or anything, you know, find out who I can ask for money, you know, for grants and stuff. Pretty much that's it. If you have any questions or anything.

ON BEHALF OF RICHARD WEST—REGARDING  
VOTING REFORM, MAY 7, 2001

Richard West. There has never been an event more politically controversial for this generation than the 2000 presidential election. As the weeks progressed after the election, millions of voters began to question the method for choosing the person who will become the leader of the free world. Is it fair? Is it accurate? Does it represent the people? In a nation where less than 50 percent of the population participate in electing their leader, questions such as these could alienate people who at one time considered voting from actually going to the polls. While many people addressed various means for fixing problems with the electoral process, no one has come up with a method that would allow for a smooth transition between the ballot box and the presidency. None of the methods I will outline below is a perfect solution, but each tries to maintain the tradition while minimizing the chances for errors or misrepresentation. Method 1, electoral vote splitting. For most of its existence, the Electoral College has not posed much controversy, but periodic elections have shown that even a system that works the majority of the time can have some basic flaws. Many of those problems stem from the winner-take-all nature of the Electoral College system, where a winner of the state gains all of the state's electoral votes, even if he wins only by a small popular margin. The 2000 presidential election in Florida, where both Bush and Gore received approximately half, 48.8 percent, of the electoral vote, is a prime example of how the Electoral College disproportionately favors the winner of a state over the loser. Electoral vote splitting is an excellent method for eliminating much of the sense of disproportionality. While the system preserves the winner-take-all tradition for most popular elections, it splits the electoral votes between the Republican and

Democratic candidates proportionally to the percentage of the popular vote if the race is tight. Figure 1, which you have a copy of in front of you—and, hopefully, everybody has a copy in the audience—shows generally how the process of electoral vote splitting works. Since this method only affects close elections, it is necessary to define what a "close election" actually is. A close election is when two primary candidates' popular vote percentages are within a certain predetermined range. In this formula, delta is the average of two candidates' percentages, the range is which the blue line in figure 1 is slanted. If the candidates fall within this range, then the number of electoral votes (E) received by each candidate is given by the equation  $E = (P - Ave)ET/2 + \frac{1}{2}Et$ , where "E" is rounded, except when the vote falls within the error margin described below. If the candidates do not fall within this range, the number of electoral votes received by the winner equals the total electoral votes, and the number received by the loser equals zero. In either case, the sum of the number of electoral votes received by each of the candidates equals the total electoral vote (Et) of that state. One of the advantages of this method is that it takes into consideration the possibility of error or controversial votes. Many examples of controversial votes were exhibited in the 2000 Florida presidential election. A specific controversy was the sudden appearance of 19,000 votes that had previously been uncounted. These votes could have been legitimate or they could have been fraudulent. This method deals with situations like this similarly to New York election law. New York law states that, if there is a controversy over a certain number of votes, a candidate's winning margin must be greater than the number of controversial votes. Electoral vote splitting adopts this method by stating that if both fall within the margin epsilon, then the electoral votes are split equally, since it is impossible to determine a clear victor. Obviously, the electoral vote-splitting method is designed to accommodate two main candidates. The reason behind this decision is that, for the past 80 years, only two candidates (a Republican and a Democrat) have had a good chance of winning the presidency. While it is still possible to have three candidates in contention, it is unlikely this will occur. If this does happen, however, the electoral vote-splitting method will not work, unless Method 2 (outlined below) is also incorporated into voting reform. Method 2, "second candidate" or transferable voting. Ralph Nader's 2000 presidential campaign has been criticized as the cause of Gore's defeat in Florida. People believe that if Nader did not run, then his supporters would have supported Gore instead of them, and thus won Gore the election. Transferable voting, used in France and other European countries, would have given the option to voters of specifying a candidate for their second choice. If their first-choice candidate receives the lowest number of votes in a state election, he is eliminated, but his votes are transferred to the second-choice candidate specified by his supporter's ballots. The votes are recounted, and the process continues until there are only two remaining candidates (see figure 2, which is in the speech). It is these candidates who would then receive the electoral votes through the electoral vote-splitting method. Method 3, bubble and double-blind voting. There have been many claims that much of the controversy surrounding the 2000 presidential elections in Florida was caused by voters not